



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/602,247	06/23/2000	Ashok Kuppusamy Seattle	44431/233637(2715)MS#1494	9371
27488	7590	11/08/2005	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C. P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			NGUYEN BA, PAUL H	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2176		
DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/602,247	SEATTLE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Paul Nguyen-Ba	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 17 and 19-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 17 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/29/2005 has been entered.

2. Claims 17 and 19-21 are pending in this application. Claim 17 is an independent claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 17 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Razin, U.S. Patent No. 6,125,377, in view of Felt et al. ("Felt"), U.S. Patent No. 6,092,092, in further view of Fein et al. ("Fein"), U.S. Patent No. 6,088,711, in further view of Newbold et al. ("Newbold"), U.S. Patent No. 5,576,955.

**Regarding independent Claim 17**, Razin discloses:

*A method for improving formatting consistency within a document comprising:*

*determining a formatting run within a document, (...) (see col. 3, lines 28-*

*41; col. 5, lines 1 et seq.);*

*comparing the formatting run to a consistency rule set (see col. 3, lines 46-67 to col. 4, lines 1-34);*

*determining whether an inconsistency of the formatting run exists relative to the consistency rule set exists (see col. 4, lines 31-34; col. 14, lines 45-59 → i.e. proofreading);*

*... ;*

*....*

Razin does not specifically disclose:

*...wherein the formatting run is the smallest section of text within the document having the same formatting attributes.*

However, Felt discloses:

*...wherein the formatting run is the smallest section of text within the document having the same formatting attributes (style information is organized into style runs associated with a contiguous group of characters having the same style (see Abstract; col. 5, lines 34-67 et seq.; see also Figs. 2-5)).*

Since Razin and Felt are both from the same field of endeavor, the motivational purpose of storing style information in a manner which allows both fast access to a specific character's style information and rapid modification of that information (col. 1, lines 14-17) as disclosed by Felt would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Razin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of

Razin with the teachings of Felt to include a method wherein the style information is organized into style runs associated with a contiguous group of characters having the same style for the purpose of storing style information in a manner which allows both fast access to a specific character's style information and rapid modification of that information.

Razin suggests (see col. 5 line 65 *et seq.*), but does not specifically disclose:

*in response to determining that an inconsistency exists, identifying a majority case and a minority case of inconsistencies, wherein:*

*a majority case is a set of formatting properties that is associated with the most formatting runs in the document having an analogous formatting property, and*

*a minority case is a set of formatting properties that is inconsistent with the majority case as the inconsistency is defined by the consistency rule set;*

....

However, Fein discloses:

*in response to determining that an inconsistency exists, identifying a majority case and a minority case of inconsistencies (see Abstract and Fig. 2A), wherein:*

*a majority case is a set of formatting properties that is associated with the most formatting runs in the document having an analogous formatting property (see col. 7 line 52 to col. 9 line 30 *et seq.* and Table 1), and*

*a minority case is a set of formatting properties that is inconsistent with the majority case as the inconsistency is defined by the consistency rule set (see col. 7 line 52 to col. 9 line 30 *et seq.* and Table 2); and*

....

Since Razin and Fein are both from the same field of endeavor, the motivational purpose of defining a style of a paragraph based upon the formatting of a paragraph (col. 1 lines 7-12) as disclosed by Fein would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Razin. It would have been

Art Unit: 2176

obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Razin with the teachings of Fein.

Razin does not specifically disclose:

*revealing the minority case and the majority case to the user.*

However, Newbold discloses:

*revealing the minority case and the majority case to the user* (see Abstract → reveals formatting inconsistencies to the user).

Since Razin and Newbold are both from the same field of endeavor, the motivational purpose of providing the ability to view inconsistencies in one location and facilitating the error correction process (see Abstract) as disclosed by Newbold would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Razin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Razin with the teachings of Newbold.

**Regarding claim 19,** Razin-Felt-Fein-Newbold disclose the method with respect to independent claim 17 as discussed above, and further discloses:

*in response to revealing a minority case to a user, offering a suggested case format to the user.*

Specifically, Newbold discloses:

*in response to revealing a minority case to a user, offering a suggested case format to the user inconsistencies (see Abstract, col. 3, lines 63 et seq.; Figures 5B, 6A-2, 6B-2, 6C-2, 7A-2, 7B-2, 8B).*

Since the references are from the same field of endeavor, the motivational purpose of providing the ability to view inconsistencies in one location and facilitating the error correction process (see Abstract) as disclosed by Newbold would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Razin-Felt-Fein. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Razin-Felt-Fein with the teachings of Newbold.

#### **Claim 20**

Razin-Felt-Fein-Newbold further discloses:

*the method further comprising the steps of determining whether the suggested case format is accepted by the user (see Newbold – Abstract and Figs. 4B, 5B);*

*in response to determining that the suggested case format is accepted, reformatting the minority case to the suggested case format (see Newbold – Abstract and Figs. 4B, 5B).*

**Claim 21**

Razin-Felt-Fein-Newbold further discloses:

*the method wherein the suggested case format is the majority case (see Newbold - Abstract, col. 3, lines 63 et seq.; Figures 5B, 6A-2, 6B-2, 6C-2, 7A-2, 7B-2, 8B; see also Fein - col. 7 line 52 to col. 9 line 30 et seq. and Table 2)).*

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims filed on 8/29/2005 are substantially directed to the amended claims. The outstanding arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4094. The examiner can normally be reached on 11 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PNB

William L. Basore  
WILLIAM L. BASORE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
11/4/2005